

REMARKS

Claims 1-76 and 90 have been cancelled. Claims 77 and 80-83 have been amended. Claims 77-89 and 91-99 remain in the application.

Claims 77 and 78 are rejected for anticipation by US Patent 5,230,611 ("Shelton"). That rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 77 as amended recites a combination for controlling airflow between an air hose and an inflatable thermal device having at least one inlet port in the inflatable thermal device for being coupled with an end of the air hose, a mechanism disposed in the air hose near the end for opening to enable airflow out of the end when the end is coupled with the inlet port, and:

"means near the end for opening the mechanism in response to the inlet port coupling with the end."

In Shelton's inflator device the operation of the valve 28 in the inflation mechanism is not related to or dependent on coupling the end of an air hose with the inflation valve 38. It will operate whether or not the end of the air hose is coupled with the inflation valve. Therefore, there are no means near the end of the air hose that open the valve 28 "in response to the inlet port coupling with the end" to enable airflow through the end of the air hose.

Claims 79-83 are rejected for obviousness over Shelton. That rejection is respectfully traversed because of the failure of Shelton to include the "means near the end for opening the mechanism in response to the inlet port coupling with the end." Further, Shelton fails to include "a hinge lever", "seating cams", "a gear rack mounted lever", first and second magnets, or equivalents thereof.

Claims 84-89 and 91-99 are rejected for obviousness over Shelton in view of US Patent 5,318,568 ("Kaufmann"). That rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The contention in the Office Action is that Shelton discloses one way valves which make obvious a method that includes, among other acts "opening the mechanism/valve in response to pressurized airflow". The recitation of the claims includes "operating the mechanism in response to coupling " one end of an air hose to an inlet port "to permit an airflow out of the one end." The recitation is *not* "operating the mechanism in response to pressurized airflow." If the examiner is of the opinion that operating the mechanism in response to *pressurized airflow* (per Shelton) teaches or suggests "coupling the one end with the inlet port" and "operating the mechanism in

response to *coupling* to permit an airflow out of the one end" (per the rejected claims), the applicants respectfully request citation of a reference or entry of the examiner's affidavit in support. Otherwise, the requirements of *prima facie* obviousness have not been met and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,



TERRANCE A. MEADOR
Reg. No. 30, 298

Date: June 18, 2004

INCAPLAW
1050 Rosecrans Street, Suite K
San Diego, CA 92106

Telephone: (619) 222-2531 Fax: (619) 222-2327